UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,251	09/23/1999	CATHERINE M. KEENE	021756-047400US	4434

20350 7590 04/09/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
PHAM, HUNG Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/401,251	KEENE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. PHAM	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Duplicate Claims, Warning

The warning of duplicate claims 17 and 18 has been withdrawn due to the cancellation of these claims.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the warning of duplicate claims 14-16 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The limitation "***a computer program storage device***" as recited in claim 14 is considered as being equivalent to the memory as recited in claim 1. The steps of "***establishing privilege access criteria***", "***receiving an object request by an individual user***" and "***verifying the individual user's privilege access criteria***" as recited in claims 15 and 16 are implied in the steps of "*access data application code being responsive to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within a version of an object and to predetermined modification privileges for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object by an individual user, wherein the version of the object that may be viewed or modified by said individual user, herein termed a requested object, is a redacted version where the data that is redacted varies according to said individual user's predetermined access or modification privileges*".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Claim 7 was rejected because the claimed limitation, ***allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within said requested object according to an individual user's predetermined privileges in response to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within said redacted***

object, was not described in the specification. Applicant argued that the rejected limitation was described on page 8 lines 6-11. The description on page 8 has been considered and the description on page 8 does not have any description with respect to ***access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within said redacted object***. In short, the step of ***allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within said requested object according to an individual user's predetermined privileges in response to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within said redacted object*** was supported by the specification.

- Claims 13 and 14 was rejected because the claimed limitation, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user***, was not described in the specification. Applicant argued that the rejected limitation was described on page 8 lines 6-11. The description on page 8 has been considered and the description on page 8 does not have any description with respect to ***privilege access criteria*** and ***the scope of access of a version of the object***. In short, the step of ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user*** as recited in claims 13 and 14 was not supported by the specification.

- Similar to claims 13 and 14, the description on page 8 does not have any description with respect to the claimed limitations, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user*** and ***setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges for transmission to the individual user***, as recited in claim 15 and the claimed limitations, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access permitted to a user of a version of an object… receiving an object request by a user via a network for access to a version of an object… setting up a version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges***, as recited in claim 16.

In view of the forgoing arguments, the examiner continues the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as in the following manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Applicant's arguments with respect the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Duplicate Claims, Warning

Applicant is advised that should claim 1, 7 and 13 be found allowable, claims 14-16 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 7 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As recited in claim 1, the claimed limitation, ***access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object***, was not described in the specification.

As recited in claim 7, the claimed limitations ***access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object transferred*** and ***allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within said requested object according to an individual user's predetermined privileges in response to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within said redacted object***, were not described in the specification.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the claimed limitation, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user***, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 15, the claimed limitations, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user*** and ***setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges for transmission to the individual user*** were not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 16, the claimed limitation, ***establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access permitted to a user of a version of an object… receiving an object request by a user via a network for access to a version of an object… setting up a version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges***, was not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gervais et al. [US 6,381,579 B1] in view of Win et al. [UPS 6,453,353 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Gervais teaches a method and a business-entity data-exchange system ***for providing the transfer of and the controlled access to a version of an object and other associated information of a file by a plurality of users from different business entities, said business entities being business partners or potential business partners producing products and component parts from different companies throughout a product supply chain*** (Gervais, Abstract). The Gervais system comprises:

a database for storing an object and associated information (Gervais, FIG. 5 illustrates a database for storing "Xspan Briefing Center" resource as ***object*** and "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***associated information***), ***the object comprising distinguishable***

groups of data (The "Xspan Briefing Center" comprising "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***distinguishable groups of data***),

each group of data having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67, read and read/write access criteria);

said data comprising multiple elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design data, development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business document data, business agreements data, OEM products and component data, CEM products and component data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data, color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 5, data comprising "AAA Supplier Network" as ***supply chain data*** and "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***business document data***);

an application server configured with memory and operation software code to control access to data stored in the database and to set up and send a document file having a representation of an object and associated documents that are stored in the database (EnterpriseXspan Environment Server (Col. 4 Lines 30-33) as ***an application server***. The ***memory and operation software code*** are inherited features of EnterpriseXspan Environment Server. EnterpriseXspan Environment Server ***control access to data stored in the database***, e.g., "Xspan Briefing Center", "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" by checking user identity and authenticate using Lotus Domino Application (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-5). The Lotus Domino Application determines who can read and edit

the document. If a user is rejected by the application, that document will not appear to that rejected user (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 6-13). As seen, access to a document with associated documents in FIG. 5, e.g., "AAA Supplier Announcements" and associated "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega", as ***a document file having a representation of an object and associated documents that are stored in the database*** is controlled by Lotus Domino Application);

access data application code stored in the memory and executable by the application server (Name and Address Book is used by Lotus Domino Application to control access based on Reader and Author name fields in Name and Address Book (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-13). The Reader and Author name as ***access data application code*** is ***executable by*** Lotus Domino Application as ***the application server***. Storing the Reader and Author name ***in the memory*** is an inherited feature of Gervais technique),

said access data application code being responsive to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within a version of an object and to predetermined modification privileges for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object by an individual user (Each entity in the system hierarchy of containers and resources has both a group of users and a group of managers. The user group has read access and the management group has read/write access to the entity (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67). As shown in FIG. 7, the string "$Managers" is used to represent the group of all system managers in the NetTop Hierarchy and the string "$Users" is used to represent the group of all users in the hierarchy. String such as "M1", "M2" and "M3" are used to represent individual users for creating and managing the resources. Strings such as "U1", "U2" and "U3" are used to represent users for viewing the resources only (Gervais, Col. 11 Lines 26-39). The Gervais teaching as discussed indicates ***access data application code*** in the form of Reader and Author names, e.g., "M1", "M2", "M3", U1", "U2" and "U3", ***being responsive to said access criteria associated with said groups of data contained within a version of***

an object, e.g., read and read/write access criteria associated with "AAA Supplier Announcements", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" within "Xspan Briefing Center" in the original version, ***and to predetermined modification privileges for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object by an individual user***, e.g., predetermined read/write privileges for modifying "AAA Supplier Announcements", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" within "Xspan Briefing Center" in the original version by a user that has the privilege);

wherein the version of the object may be viewed or modified by said individual user, herein termed a requested object, is a redacted version where the data that is redacted varies according to said individual user's predetermined access or modification privilege (As disclosed by Gervais, if a user's name is not in the Reader Names field of Name and Address Book, then that document will not appear to the user through an interface (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 10-13). Thus, the original version of "Xspan Briefing Center" may be viewed by individual user is a redacted version, e.g., documents will not appear if the user does not have access to them, and the documents which are redacted varies according to predetermined read access);

Although ***predetermined access or modification privileges of said individual user vary*** (The predetermined access of users as disclosed by Gervais are different as shown in FIG. 1, Col. 6 Lines 18-27. However, Gervais does not explicitly teach that the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship between a business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and a business entity that controls said data exchange system***.

Win discloses a system and method for controlling access to resources based on user roles (Win, Abstract). As disclosed by Win, access to resources is controlled by user roles. A role reflects a relationship of a user to the organization, e.g., employee, customer, distributor,

supplier, engineering, human resource… (Win, Col. 5 Lines 21-33). Roles determine what resources a user can access (Win, Col. 5 Lines 44-54). The Win teaching as discussed indicates the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship***, e.g., user role, ***between a business entity that said individual user is affiliated with***, e.g., user is an employee, customer, distributor or supplier, ***and a business entity that controls said data exchange system***, e.g., the organization.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include user roles as taught by Win into Gervais system and method in order to govern access to resources in which selective access is given to particular users.

Regarding claim 7, Gervais teaches a method for ***controlling access to business-entity data-exchange objects stored in electronic from*** (Gervais, Abstract). The Gervais method comprises:

storing an object in as database (Gervais, FIG. 5 illustrates a database for storing "Xspan Briefing Center" resource as ***object***), ***the object comprising distinguishable groups of data*** (The "Xspan Briefing Center" comprising "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***distinguishable groups of data***),

each group of data having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67, read and read/write access criteria);

said data comprising multiple elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design data, development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business document data, business agreements data, OEM products and component data, CEM products and component data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data,

color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 5, data comprising "AAA Supplier Network" as ***supply chain data*** and "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***business document data***);

controlling the access to data stored in the database using an application server configured to set up a redacted version of an object, herein termed a requested object, according to access criteria established for a user (EnterpriseXspan Environment Server (Col. 4 Lines 30-33) as ***an application server***. EnterpriseXspan Environment Server ***control access to data stored in the database***, e.g., "Xspan Briefing Center", "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" by checking user identity and authenticate using Lotus Domino Application (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-5). The Lotus Domino Application determines who can read and edit the document. If a user is rejected by the application, that document will not appear to that rejected user (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 6-13). As seen, the original version of "Xspan Briefing Center" may be viewed by individual user is a redacted version, e.g., documents will not appear if the user does not have access to them, and the documents which are redacted varies according to predetermined read access as ***a redacted version of an object, herein termed a requested object, according to access criteria established for a user*** is controlled by Lotus Domino Application);

storing software code for controlling the operation of said application server's CPU in said application server's memory (This is an inherited feature of Gervais technique. The Lotus Domino Application as ***software code for controlling the operation*** of EnterpriseXspan Environment Server as ***application server's CPU*** must be stored in EnterpriseXspan Environment Server's ***memory***);

transferring said requested object to a user in the form of a document file having said requested object and any associated documents requested by a user contained therein (FIG. 5 indicates ***requested object***, e.g., "Xspan Briefing Center" is ***transferred*** to ***a user in the form of a document file having said requested object and any associated documents requested by a user contained therein***, e.g., "AAA Supplier Network", "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega");

allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within said requested object according to individual user's predetermined privileges in response to said access criteria associated with said group of data contained within said redacted object (Each entity in the system hierarchy of containers and resources has both a group of users and a group of managers. The user group has read access and the management group has read/write access to the entity (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67). If a user's name is not in the Reader Names field of Name and Address Book, then that document will not appear to the user through an interface (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 10-13). The Gervais teaching indicates ***in response to said access criteria associated with said group of data contained within said redacted object***, e.g., "Xspan Briefing Center" with not appear documents is a redacted object with respect to user that does not have user's name in the Reader Names field of Name and Address Book, ***allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within said requested object according to individual user's predetermined privileges***, e.g., access to the groups of data in FIG. 5 is controlled based on read and read/write privileges of that particular user).

Although ***predetermined access or modification privileges of said individual user vary*** (The predetermined access of users as disclosed by Gervais are different as shown in FIG. 1, Col. 6 Lines 18-27. However, Gervais does not explicitly teach that the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship between a business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and a business entity that controls said data exchange system***.

Win discloses a system and method for controlling access to resources based on user roles (Win, Abstract). As disclosed by Win, access to resources is controlled by user roles. A role reflects a relationship of a user to the organization, e.g., employee, customer, distributor, supplier, engineering, human resource… (Win, Col. 5 Lines 21-33). Roles determine what resources a user can access (Win, Col. 5 Lines 44-54). The Win teaching as discussed indicates the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship***, e.g., user role, ***between a business entity that said individual user is affiliated with***, e.g., user is an employee, customer, distributor or supplier, ***and a business entity that controls said data exchange system***, e.g., the organization.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include user roles as taught by Win into Gervais system and method in order to govern access to resources in which selective access is given to particular users.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 15 and 16, Gervais teaches business-entity data-exchange device, comprising:

a computer program storage device readable by a digital processing apparatus (A memory and CPU are inherited features of Gervais teaching);

a program stored on the program storage device and including instructions executable by the digital processing apparatus for controlling the apparatus to perform a method for viewing and modifying an object to allow a user to view and modify a redacted version of an object stored in a file (EnterpriseXspan Environment Server (Col. 4 Lines 30-33)), comprising:

computer readable code means for establishing an object in a storage location (Gervais, FIG. 5 illustrates a database for storing “Xspan Briefing Center” resource as ***object***);

said object containing data comprising one or more elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design

data, development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business documents data, business agreements data, OEM products and components data, CEM products and components data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component, part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data, color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross-reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data, quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 5, data comprising "AAA Supplier Network" as ***supply chain data*** and "Project Alpha" and "Project Omega" as ***business document data***);

computer readable code means for identifying a user to have limited access to information associated with the object (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-13);

computer readable code means for establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67);

computer readable code means for receiving an object request by a requestor (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-13);

computer readable code means for verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-13); and

computer readable code means for transmitting a redacted version of the requested object in the form of a redacted document that masks information according to the requestor's user privilege access criteria (FIG. 5).

Although ***predetermined access or modification privileges of said individual user vary*** (The predetermined access of users as disclosed by Gervais are different as shown in FIG. 1, Col. 6 Lines 18-27. However, Gervais does not explicitly teach that the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship between a***

business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and a business entity that controls said data exchange system.

Win discloses a system and method for controlling access to resources based on user roles (Win, Abstract). As disclosed by Win, access to resources is controlled by user roles. A role reflects a relationship of a user to the organization, e.g., employee, customer, distributor, supplier, engineering, human resource… (Win, Col. 5 Lines 21-33). Roles determine what resources a user can access (Win, Col. 5 Lines 44-54). The Win teaching as discussed indicates the differences in user predetermined access ***according to a status of a product-manufacturing business relationship***, e.g., user role, ***between a business entity that said individual user is affiliated with***, e.g., user is an employee, customer, distributor or supplier, ***and a business entity that controls said data exchange system***, e.g., the organization, ***wherein said business entities are from different companies***, e.g., the organization and distributor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include user roles as taught by Win into Gervais system and method in order to govern access to resources in which selective access is given to particular users.

Regarding claim 2, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Gervais further discloses ***access data application code enables controls the ability of said individual user to read the contents of said requested object that was sent by the application server according to access privileges associated with said individual user*** (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 3, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 2, Gervais further discloses ***access data application code enables said individual user to modify the contents of said requested object; and store the modified contents***

in said memory of said application server (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67 and storing the modified contents in the memory is an inherited feature of Gervais teaching).

Regarding claim 4, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Gervais further discloses ***access data application code enables said individual user ability to modify includes the ability to delete information contained in said requested object; and store said modified requested object in said memory of said application server*** (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67 and storing the modified contents in the memory is an inherited feature of Gervais teaching).

Regarding claim 5, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Gervais further discloses ***access data application code enables said individual user ability add data to said requested object; and store said modified requested object in said memory of said application server*** (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67 and storing the modified contents in the memory is an inherited feature of Gervais teaching).

Regarding claim 6, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Gervais further discloses ***individual user's access to the redacted version of the object is determined by a business relationship to produce products*** (Gervais, Col. 9 Lines 60-67) ***and defined by the host according to the need of information in a product chain*** (Gervais, Col. 8 Lines 60-65), ***and wherein said requested object is configured to reveal limited information according to a guest user's predetermined access privileges*** (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 10-13).

Regarding claim 8, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Gervais further discloses the steps of:

receiving an object request by a individual user (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-14);

verifying the individual user's user privilege access criteria (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-14); and

transmitting a requested object configured to reveal information contained with in said requested object according to the individual user's user privilege access criteria (Gervais, Col. 10 Lines 1-14).

Regarding claim 9, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Gervais further discloses the step of ***establishing a version of an object by loading information into the version of the object into separate groups having separate access privilege criteria*** (FIG. 5 and Col. 9 Lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 11, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 8, Gervais further discloses the steps of ***extracting the individual user's user identification from the object request, verifying the individual user's user identification and identifying the groups of data within the requested object to which the individual user has access*** (Col. 9 Line 61-Col. 10 Line 20).

Regarding claim 12, Gervais and Win, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Gervais further discloses the step of ***transmitting a redacted version of an object by sending a requested object to the individual user that contains the groups of information to which the individual user has access to and that excludes groups of information associated with an object that is redacted so that the individual user has limited access*** (Col. 9 Line 61-Col. 10 Line 20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HUNG Q PHAM/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2168

April 1, 2008